DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 028 PS 025 384

AUTHOR Westerman, Michael A.; And Others
TITLE Interpersonal Defense: School-Aged Children's Understanding of the Effects of Conflict and Feed Forward Consequences.
PUB DATE Apr 97
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (62nd, Washington, DC, April 3-6, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academically Gifted; Age Differences; *Children; Comparative Analysis; *Conflict Resolution; Coping; Discourse Analysis; Elementary Education; Interaction; Interpersonal Relationship
IDENTIFIERS New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This study used an interpersonal model of defense to examine children's understanding of how defense affects ongoing interactions. Participating were 62 New York City public school children, ages 7 to 8 years and 10 to 11 years, who were identified as intellectually gifted. Students were asked to respond to structured questions about interpersonal interactions with a teacher or a peer presented in a storyboard format in either high- or low-conflict versions, with defensive responses operationalized as an unmarked shift in topic or an unmarked negation of a prior statement. The results indicated that older participants, but not younger subjects, anticipated greater defensiveness in high-conflict situations. There was considerable support for hypotheses about children's understanding of how defense affects ongoing interactions. Nondefensive responses were viewed as more likely than defensive statements to lead to both wished-for and feared interaction consequences. No significant relations were found between teacher reported assessments of participants' behavior problems and the measure of their understanding of interpersonal defense. Overall, the findings suggested that bright school-age children have an understanding of the functional role played by defensive behavior in interpersonal interactions. (Appendices contain the stories used in the assessment.) (Author/KDFB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 408 028

Running Head: CHILDREN'S UNDERSTANDING OF INTERPERSONAL DEFENSE

Interpersonal Defense: School-Aged Children's Understanding of the Effects of Conflict and Feed Forward Consequences

Michael A. Westerman,

Nancy Corral, Thomas Cosgrove, and Elena D. Jeffries

New York University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael A. Westerman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 025384

This paper was presented at the meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, D.C., April 1997. Correspondence about the paper should be sent to Michael A. Westerman, Department of Psychology, New York University, 6 Washington Place, 4th Floor, New York, NY 10003.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study was based on a new approach to the study of defense, which draws on the psychoanalytic roots of the concept, but views defense from an interpersonal perspective. According to this approach, interpersonal defense plays a functional role in interactions. Sixty-two gifted school-aged children aged 7-8 and 10-11 participated. They were administered a storyboard procedure designed to assess children's understanding of interpersonal defense. The results for the older participants, but not the younger subjects, supported the hypothesis that children would anticipate greater defensiveness in high-conflict situations. Other findings provided considerable support for hypotheses about children's understanding of how defense affects ongoing interactions. Nondefensive responses were viewed as more likely than defensive statements to lead to both wished-for and feared interaction consequences. No significant relations were found between teacher reported assessments of participants' behavior problems and the measure of their understanding of interpersonal defense in this sample. Overall, the findings suggest that bright school-aged children have an understanding of the functional role played by defensive behavior in interpersonal interactions.

Interpersonal Defense: School-Aged Children's
Understanding of the Effects of Conflict and Feed-Forward Consequences

The present study is based on a new approach to the study of defense that draws on the psychoanalytic roots of the concept (e.g., Cramer, 1991) but views defense from an interpersonal perspective (Westerman, 1997; Westerman & Steen, 1997). According to this interpersonal reconceptualization of defense, defensive behaviors are a unique and complex class of discourse processes designed to negotiate conflict.

There are three key points to this approach. First, the model calls for focusing on interpersonal behavior, which should not simply be viewed as an indirect marker of intrapsychic phenomena. The second point is that discourse analysis provides an especially useful method for identifying interpersonal defense behaviors, as suggested by recent research (Horowitz, Milbrath, Reidbord, & Stinson, 1993; Koback & Duemmler, 1994; Westerman & Foote, 1995). The third point is that defensive behaviors play a functional role in interactions. They represent attempts to pursue wished-for outcomes in an ongoing interaction while simultaneously avoiding feared consequences. Therefore, defensive behavior is more likely to occur in situations where pursuing a wish could lead to a feared result than in situations without such conflict. Furthermore, defensive behaviors "feed forward" to affect interpersonal events. Interpersonal defense reduces the likelihood of feared outcomes, but also reduces the likelihood of wished-for outcomes.

The present study employed this model to investigate children's understanding of defense in a sample of intellectually gifted school-aged participants. We examined children's responses to structured questions about interpersonal vignettes presented in a storyboard format. Based on

theoretical studies cited above on problematic discourse patterns, defensive responses were operationalized as either an unmarked *shift in topic* or an unmarked *negation of a prior statement* in these vignettes.

The first hypothesis we investigated was that subjects would be more likely to endorse a defensive response when presented with a high-conflict story than when presented with a low-conflict story. Other hypotheses were based on the idea that defensive behavior plays a functional role in interpersonal interactions. Specifically, we hypothesized that participants would rate nondefensive responses (relative to defensive responses) as more likely to lead to both a wished-for response and also more likely to lead to a feared response. These outcomes were represented by positive and negative replies by a character in the storyboard vignettes. Thus, this part of the study examined children's understanding of the consequences of defensive behavior. We also investigated relations between teacher reported assessments of participants' behavior problems and individual differences in our measures of children's understanding of interpersonal defense. Defense and psychopathology have been closely linked in both clinical and research literature (Cramer, 1991; Vaillant, 1992). However, theory and research to date have focused on intrapsychic defense mechanisms. Research on developmental social cognition (e.g., Dodge, 1980; Flavell, 1974) offers support for the general idea that children's understanding of the interpersonal phenomena identified by the interpersonal defense approach may be associated with behavior problems.

Method

Participants

Sixty-two children from a New York City public school participated. Participants were in one of two age groups, a 7-8 year-old group (M = 95.22 months, SD = 7.13 months) and a 10-11 year-old group (M = 124.57 months, SD = 5.76 months). The school from which the sample was recruited included five academic tracks. Participants for this study were recruited only from the two brightest tracks. Subjects from these two tracks were not significantly different on the Information and Vocabulary subtests of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III), $t = 1.48$, $p > .10$. The sample was a relatively homogenous upper middle-class group of children. Hence, it was not representative of the population at large in terms of either intelligence or socioeconomic status.

Measures and Procedure

Participants were administered the Information and Vocabulary subtests of the WISC-III. Children's parents or guardians were asked by mail to complete a detailed demographic questionnaire. In addition, teachers were asked to complete the Teacher Report Form of the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) for each participant.

The measures of primary interest were based on children's responses to structured questions about interpersonal vignettes presented in storyboard format. This procedure was developed for the current study. Each child was shown one of two storyboard vignettes, which depict a child interacting with either a teacher or a peer (see Appendixes A and B for text of the stories). Depending on their sex, participants were shown a character named Chrissy or Chris participating in an interaction. Each story consists of a narrative and five turns in a dialogue,

presented by means of successive panels on the storyboard. Stories were presented in either high-conflict or low- conflict versions. In the high-conflict versions, the narrative includes an explicit statement of both a wish and a fear and the third turn of the dialogue is a response by the other person in the direction of the feared outcome. In the low-conflict version, the narrative includes only a statement of the wish and the third dialogue turn is neutral.

The procedure was divided into three parts: a training phase, a closed-ended question phase, and an open-ended question phase. During the training phase, children were first trained on a "Like-Block" task. Children were shown a set of seven blocks and told that each block represents a quantity of "like." Hence, a child could demonstrate how much he or she liked something by assigning it one to seven blocks. Each child was then asked to assign blocks to pairs of popular foods and to describe the meaning of the block distribution to demonstrate competence with the procedure. The second response procedure, a "slide" with six possible responses (ranging from "no way" to "definitely yes") was then introduced to the child. The participant was shown how to answer questions using the slide. Rather than being limited to dichotomous responses, children were shown how they could express uncertainty by choosing between "no way " or "definitely yes" on the six-point scale. The experimenter practiced with the child until he or she was certain that the child understood these methods for responding to questions.

The second phase of the procedure involves presenting the story and a set of closed-ended questions (using the response procedures described above). Each story was divided into two main parts: a narrative in which the main character and plot are introduced and a dialogue between Chris/Chrissy and a friend or teacher. The first turn of the dialogue is always taken by

Chris/Chrissy's friend or teacher, and the second turn is taken by Chris/Chrissy. The third turn (or *stem*) by the teacher or friend is a response to Chris/Chrissy's previous turn. The fourth turn (called the *response*) is Chris/Chrissy's defensive or nondefensive response to the teacher or friend's previous turn. Finally, the teacher or peer's final turn (the *reply*) is the short-term outcome of the conversation. The *positive reply* represents Chris/Chrissy's wish, while the *negative reply* represents Chris/Chrissy's fear. The stories were illustrated and are presented in a comic strip format. The first panel shows Chris/Chrissy by him/herself. It is displayed while the introduction is read by the interviewer. The second through fifth panels show each turn in the dialogue between Chris/Chrissy and his/her teacher or friend.

The experimenter began taking the participant through the story by placing the first panel on the storyboard and reading the narrative introduction. The experimenter continued by reading the dialogue while placing each of the five panels on the storyboard. The first decision point occurred after the experimenter presented the third turn, the story's stem. Participants were asked to rate the likelihood of Chris/Chrissy making the defensive versus nondefensive response by making a forced-choice comparison between the two responses using the "Like-Block" task. For example, seven blocks for one response and none for the other would indicate that the child believed that Chris/Chrissy definitely would make one response and not the other; four blocks for one response and three blocks for the other would mean that the participant believed that Chris/Chrissy was only slightly more likely to make one response rather than the other. Each child was then asked to explain his or her answer to ensure understanding.

Before moving onto the next set of questions, the participants were administered the Information subtest of the WISC-III. Following the Information subtest, participants were

presented with the final replies of the teacher or friend. Participants were asked to rate the likelihood that the defensive and nondefensive responses would lead to the positive and negative replies. Participants rated the likelihood of each on the six-point slide described above, which ranges from "no way" to "definitely yes".

After the closed-ended portion of procedure was completed, the Vocabulary subtest of the WISC-III was administered followed by an open-ended interview. Interview questions included an open-ended version of the closed-ended question about the defensive versus the nondefensive response. Specifically, participants were asked how they would respond to the story's stem. Participants were also asked to explain why Chris/Chrissy might be more likely to give one response rather than the other. In addition, participants were asked whether they thought Chrissy's responses were attempts to obtain a desired reply or to avoid a feared outcome. Analyses of responses to these open-ended questions are not included in the present report, with the exception of one question asking participants whether Chris/Chrissy was having a difficult time deciding what to say. This question was designed as a check of the conflict manipulation. We anticipated that the participants in the high-conflict condition would give higher ratings in response to this question about whether the story protagonist was having a difficult time deciding what to say.

Design

A between-subjects experimental design with stratified sampling was used. Each of the sixty-two subjects was randomly assigned to either a high- or low-conflict version of the teacher or peer story. Four orders were created to systematically counterbalance the order in which responses and replies were presented. This resulted in a 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 x4 (Sex x Age x Conflict x

Story x Order) design. Two of the 64 cells in the design were not filled due to subject recruitment difficulties.

Results

Effects of Conflict on Defense

We investigated the hypothesis that participants in the high-conflict condition as compared to those in the low-conflict condition would give greater endorsements of the defensive response. This would be demonstrated in our procedure by participants in the high-conflict condition assigning more blocks to the defensive response than to the nondefensive response.

The variable of main concern was the extent to which participants believed Chris or Chrissy, the story's protagonist, would make a defensive versus a nondefensive response. The possible range of this variable was 0 to 7, with high scores indicating that the participant rated the defensive response as more likely than the nondefensive response. The mean of this measure in the full sample was 1.82 (SD=1.63), indicating that participants generally rated the nondefensive response as more likely than the defensive response.

Preliminary analyses were performed to determine whether order could be omitted from subsequent analyses. No significant main effect of order was found, nor were there any significant interactions between order and age, sex, story, or conflict condition. Therefore, order was not included in subsequent analyses concerning childrens' responses about the likelihood that the story protagonist would respond in a defensive versus a nondefensive manner.

An ANOVA was then performed which examined the effects of age (younger versus older group), sex (male versus female), story (peer or teacher), conflict condition (high versus

low-conflict), and their interactions. Results indicated that none of the main effects reached significance, although there was a trend toward significance for the effect of story condition, F (1,61) = 3.38, p <.071. An investigation of the means showed that the trend towards significance for the effect of story resulted from participants responding more in favor of the defensive response in the peer story (M=2.2, SD=1.79) than in the teacher story (M=1.47, SD=1.41). More importantly, the age by conflict condition interaction was highly significant, F (1, 61) = 8.4, p < .005. The result was then followed up by examining the effect of conflict in the 2 age groups (see Table 1). Results were significant for older subjects (t = -2.67, p = .01), but not for younger subjects (t = 1.31, p > .20) .

As a check of the conflict manipulation, we performed an analysis of participants' ratings of how much difficulty Chris/Chrissy was having deciding what to say to his or her friend or teacher. Using an identical procedure as above, a preliminary analysis indicated that order could be removed from further consideration. An ANOVA identical to the one performed above indicated significant main effects for conflict condition [F (1, 61) = 12.14, p < .034] and story, F (1, 61) = 4.75, p = .03. There were no significant interactions. An examination of means revealed that participants in the peer story attributed more indecision to Chris/Chrissy than did participants in the teacher story (peer story: M=5.03, SD=.93; teacher story: M=4.5, SD=1.08). The relevant finding is the main effect of conflict condition. As anticipated, participants in the high-conflict condition indicated that they thought Chris/Chrissy was having a more difficult time deciding what to say than did the participants in the low-conflict condition. In the high-conflict condition, participants' mean-level response was M=5.16, SD=.77, and in the low-conflict condition mean-level response was M=4.33, SD=1.12.

Feed-Forward Effects

A 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 (Sex x Age x Story x Conflict Condition) repeated measures mixed model ANOVA, with defense vs. nondefense as a within-subjects factor, was performed to test the hypothesis that participants would believe that negative outcomes would be more likely to result from nondefensive responses as compared to defensive responses. An identical ANOVA was also performed to test the hypothesis that participants would believe that positive outcomes would be more likely to result from nondefensive as compared to defensive responses. Order was excluded from all analyses because it was counterbalanced in the design and did not interact significantly with any factors.

The analysis related to negative outcomes yielded a significant main effect of defense versus nondefense, $F(1, 46) = 67.28$, $p < .001$. No significant main effects were found for story, age, sex, or conflict condition. There also was a significant two-way interaction between defense and story, $F(1, 46) = 20.33$, $p < .001$. Follow-up ANOVAS were performed to examine the effects of defense in each of the stories separately. Participants rated the likelihood of the negative outcomes to be significantly greater following the nondefensive response as compared to the defensive response in both the teacher [$F(1, 24) = 4.65$, $p = .04$] and peer stories, [$F(1, 22) = 195.68$, $p < .001$], although the effect was stronger in the peer story. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for participants' ratings in the teacher and peer stories.

The ANOVA based on positive outcomes showed that defense versus nondefense had a significant main effect, $F(1, 46) = 10.66$, $p < .002$. No significant main effects were found for story, age, sex, or conflict condition. Again, a significant two-way interaction between defense and story was found, $F(1, 46) = 10.07$, $p < .003$. Follow-up analyses were performed in each of

the two stories. There was a significant effect of defense on the positive outcome in the teacher story [$F(1, 24) = 26.25$, $p < .001$], but not in the peer story. Table 2 shows that in the teacher story, participants rated the likelihood of the positive outcome to be greater following the nondefensive response as compared to the defensive one.

Relations Between Behavior Problems and Understanding of Interpersonal Defense

Several regressions were performed to explore relations between behavior problems and interpersonal defense. Behavior problems were represented by four CBCL summary variables: Total Behavior Problems, Internalizing Behavior Problems, Externalizing Behavior Problems, and Adaptive Functioning. Means and standard deviations of each variable were computed for the total sample, for male participants, for female participants, and for each age group. The descriptive statistics are shown in Table 3. For the total sample, the means for Total Behavior Problems and Externalizing Behavior Problems fell below the population mean (at the 31%ile and the 34%ile of the population, respectively). The mean for Internalizing Behavior Problems was equivalent to the population mean. The Adaptive Functioning mean was approximately 1 standard deviation above the population mean (85%ile). Overall, the sample fell well below the population mean for behavior problems and scores were distributed over a somewhat restricted range.

The different components of the interpersonal defense model were reflected in 5 dependent variables: Defensiveness (rated likelihood of character choosing defensive versus nondefensive response), Positive Given Defense (rated likelihood that defensive response will lead to positive outcome), Positive Given Nondefense (rated likelihood that nondefensive response will lead to positive outcome), Negative Given Defense (rated likelihood that defensive

response will lead to negative outcome), and Negative Given Nondefense (rated likelihood that nondefensive response will lead to negative outcome). Two additional dependent variables were computed in an attempt to measure individual differences more explicitly by considering participants' feed forward responses relative to one another. These two variables (Positive Given Defense - Positive Given Nondefense and Negative Given Defense - Negative Given Nondefense) reflect the rated likelihood that the defensive response will lead to a given reply *relative* to the same participant's rated likelihood that the nondefensive response will lead to each reply.

Preliminary regressions were performed to determine whether or not order independently accounted for a significant amount of the variance of each of the 7 interpersonal defense variables. No main effects were significant and order was not included in subsequent analyses. SES was not found to be correlated with any of the independent or dependent variables and was also omitted from all analyses.

Hierarchical regressions were performed on the full model. This set of analyses included Sex, IQ, and Age (in months) entered on the first step, Story entered on the second step, Conflict Condition entered on the third step, one of four CBCL variables entered on a fourth step, and an interaction term entered on the final step. There was a total of 28 separate regressions. These analyses yielded no main effects for the 4 CBCL variables regressed on the 7 CIDM variables. This indicates that behavior problems did not predict participants' understanding of interpersonal defense in our sample. In a final set of analyses, a total of 112 regressions were performed to examine interactions. The interaction term entered on the final step of each regression was one of 16 possible combinations of the 4 CBCL variables with Sex, Age, Story or Conflict Condition.

Thus, a total of 16 regressions was run for each of the 7 dependent variables. Results from this set of analyses also were not significant.

Discussion

Overall, results of the study offered support for the basic hypotheses prescribed by our model of interpersonal defense. Findings related to the effect of conflict on participants' expectations that the story protagonist would respond defensively confirmed the hypothesis in the older group, but not the younger group. As predicted, older participants rated the likelihood that Chris/Chrissy would make the defensive rather than the nondefensive responses as more likely in the high-conflict than in the low-conflict condition.

These results offer strong support for the first hypothesis investigated, although they raise questions about why the younger participants did not respond to the conflict manipulation in the predicted manner. One possibility is that younger children are not as sensitive to conflict as older children. The results from the manipulation check, however, do not support this explanation. Nonetheless, there is the possibility that the manipulation check question was not an adequate assessment of whether the participants perceived the conflict. Different results may be provided by further analyses of the open-ended interviews, which are currently in progress.

In this initial investigation of the interpersonal defense model, the results provide considerable support for the feed forward hypothesis. As predicted, participants believed nondefensive responses, relative to defensive ones, were more likely to lead to negative outcomes in both stories, and to the positive outcome in the teacher story. These findings suggest that participants understood that interpersonal defense results in both gains and losses in the short-term. While defensive behavior successfully avoids feared outcomes, it also

simultaneously sacrifices a wish.

The feed forward hypothesis was not supported by the positive reply in the peer story. Significant results were found for the negative outcome in the peer story and children demonstrated understanding of the story before completing the feed forward rating task. Therefore, participants clearly understood the task demands and the content of the story. It is possible that the positive reply was not an explicit expression of the wish. The wish, as stated in the narrative, is: "Chrissy wishes that Jenny would return her things so she could use them when she wants to..." The positive reply is: "It's yours. You should have it if you want to use it." This reply is inexact and may not have been interpreted positively by participants. An example of a more clear cut statement of the wish is: "It's yours. I will bring it over today so you can have it before your trip tomorrow." A reply such as this may have resulted in a significant finding. It is also possible that participants believe that positive outcomes in peer relationships are not contingent upon their own behaviors. Because children rated the likelihood of the positive reply as high given both responses ($\underline{M}$ = 3.40, SD = 1.52 for defensive and $\underline{M}$ = 3.47, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.55 for nondefensive), they may have an optimistic outlook in this situation. In other words, they may expect interactions with peers to turn out positively regardless of a protagonist's behavior.

The findings failed to provide support for the predicted relations between psychopathology and interpersonal defense. However, the lack of findings may be a direct result of the characteristics of our sample. The sample of children studied was not representative of the population in many respects. The children were extremely bright and the descriptive statistics for behavior problems indicate these children did not approach the threshold for clinically significant behavior problems. Future research should investigate relations between psychopathology and

interpersonal defense in a sample of children with a wider range of behavior problems.

The results of this study suggest that bright school-aged children recognize that defensive behavior represents a response to conflict (10-11 year olds only) and that they understand the complex ways in which defensive behavior impacts interaction events. Future research may be able to build on this initial study to develop a more complete account of children's understanding of processes related to interpersonal defense. To be sure, it will be important to investigate in future research whether the findings obtained can be generalized to more representative samples of children. Investigating children's understanding of these interpersonal processes is of considerable interest in itself. It also may contribute to the study of factors that lead children to behave defensively. Future research would also investigate children's social behavior in terms of the interpersonal defense approach to examine the effects of conflict on defensive behaviors, the effects of interpersonal defense on interaction events, and associations between behavior problems and defensive interpersonal processes.

References

Cramer, P. (1991). The development of defense mechanisms: Theory, research, and assessment. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Dodge, K. A. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. Child Development, 51, 162-170.

Flavell, J. H. (1974). The development of inferences about others. In T. Mischel (Ed.), Understanding other persons. Oxford: Blackwell, Basil, & Mott.

Horowitz, M., Milbath, C., Reidbord, S., & Stinson, C. (1993). Elaboration and dyselaboration: Measures of expression and defense in discourse. Psychotherapy Research, 3, 278-293.

Koback, R., & Duemmler, S. (1994). Attachment and conversation: Toward a discourse analysis of adolescent and adult security. Advances in Personal Relationships, 5, 121-149.

Vaillant, G. E. (1992). Ego mechanisms of defense: A guide for clinicians and researchers. Washington, D. C.: American Psychiatric Press.

Westerman, M.A. (1997). Reconceptualizing defense as a special type of problematic interpersonal behavior pattern: A fundamental breach by an agent-in-a-situation. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Westerman, M.A., & Foote, J.P. (1995). Patient coordination: Contrasts with other conceptualization of patients' contribution to the alliance and validity in insight-oriented psychotherapy. Psychotherapy, 32, 222-232.

Westerman, M.A., & Steen, E.M. (1997). Rethinking defense from the bottom up, or, more accurately, not top down: The interpersonal defense approach as an example of going

beyond the internal-external dichotomy. Manuscript in preparation.

Appendix A: Peer Story

Narrative

This is Chrissy. Chrissy lent her Gameboy to her friend Jenny. Jenny likes to borrow Chrissy's things. Chrissy wishes that Jenny would return her things so she could use them when she wants to, [but Chrissy is afraid that Jenny will not want to be her friend anymore if she doesn't let Jenny use her Gameboy]. [Note: only the high-conflict version contains the bracketed sentence].

Here comes Jenny now:

J: Hey, what are you doing this weekend?

C: I'm taking a long boring ride with my mother tomorrow, so I thought it would be a great time to play with my Gameboy.

Jenny Stems

High Conflict: I'm still having a really good time playing with it. If you were my friend you'd let me keep it for a while longer.

Low Conflict: I'm still having a really good time playing with it.

Chrissy Responses

Defensive: That's alright, the trip tomorrow is going to be great. Just be sure to bring it in when you're done with it.

Nondefensive: I know you want to play with it, but I really want to have it for my trip. Would you bring it over this afternoon?

Jenny Replies

Negative: I'm going to find another friend who isn't so selfish with their things (said angrily).

Positive: It's yours. You should have it if you want to use it.

Appendix B: Teacher Story

Narrative

Chrissy is in school. Her teacher just went over a reading lesson and a math lesson. Chrissy listened to what she said. Chrissy understood what she said in the reading lesson, but she didn't understand the math lesson. Now everyone is supposed to do be doing some pages in their workbooks. Chrissy has done her reading pages, but she can't do the math pages. She would really like to get some help from her teacher with the math, [but she is afraid that if she asks for help the teacher sill think she wasn't paying attention and get angry]. [Note: only the high-conflict version contains the bracketed sentence].

Now imagine the teacher comes over and says:

T: How is the workbook coming?

C: I'm having some trouble with the math pages.

Teacher Stems

High Conflict: Don't you remember what I just explained in the math lesson? I went over it three times!

Low Conflict: Do you remember what I explained in the math lesson?

Chrissy Responses

Defensive: I think I got all the reading questions right.

Nondefensive: Would you show me how to do the math again?

Teacher Replies

Negative: Well, if you're having trouble with the math problems you must not have been paying attention. I'm disappointed in you (said sternly).

Positive: Well, if the math isn't going so well, I'd be glad to help you with it the first chance I get.

Table 1

Ratings of the Likelihood of Defensive and Nondefensive Responses (number of blocks given by participant)

	Low Conflict			High Conflict		
Age	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Younger Group	2.07	.98	16	1.43	1.63	16
Older Group	1.0[a]	1.1	14	2.69[a]	2.12	16

Note: The superscript [a] indicates a significant difference in means, $p = .01$.

Table 2

Ratings of the Likelihood of Positive and Negative Replies Following Defensive or Nondefensive Responses

	Teacher Story			Peer Story		
Defense Condition	M	SD	n	M	SD	n
Negative/Defensive	2.72[a]	1.44	32	1.43[b]	.73	30
Negative/Nondefensive	3.78[a]	1.48	32	5.10[b]	1.12	30
Positive/Defensive	2.75[b]	1.61	32	3.40	1.52	30
Positive/Nondefensive	4.94[b]	1.19	32	3.47	1.55	30

Note. Ratings were made on a 6-point scale (1 = no way, 6 = definitely yes). Means with superscript "a" differ from each other at $p = .04$. Means with superscript "b" differ from each other at $p < .001$.

Table 3

Mean Behavior Problems

Group	Total Behavior Problems	Internalizing	Externalizing	Adaptive Functioning
Total Sample (N = 59)				
M	44.68	48.78	46.92	61.44
SD	9.37	8.18	7.42	12.68
Girls (n = 30)				
M	44.47	48.20	47.23	64.77
SD	8.84	7.74	6.96	12.46
Boys (n = 29)				
M	44.90	49.41	46.59	58.00
SD	10.04	8.70	7.98	12.17
Younger (n = 31)				
M	47.58	50.42	48.94	60.87
SD	9.55	9.10	7.96	12.47
Older (n = 28)				
M	41.46	47.00	44.68	62.07
SD	8.18	6.72	6.16	13.10

Note. Means are based on T-scores (Population M = 50, SD = 10)